

The one time that the minority leader has spoken out on this issue has been to condemn the Speaker of the House, the one time. The Nation has been preoccupied by White House scandals all year, and the minority leader's only response has been to blame the Speaker. That fits in very nicely with the White House strategy of spin, the whole spin, and nothing but the spin.

Clearly, they are testing the proposition that you cannot fool all the people all the time. Mr. Speaker, you cannot fool all the people all the time. And the American people have grown very weary of this White House's efforts to distract them from the truth.

We are all damaged by the White House efforts to delay this investigation, to destroy the investigator, and to deny everything to the media.

The minority leader said in his speech today, and I quote, "Ideally, we are able to put aside our partisan interests and consider 'the people's business,' if not with a blank slate, at least with an open mind."

Can the leader really believe that he has approached these issues with an open mind when the only person he blames in the very White House scandals is the Speaker of the House?

I urge the minority leader to join us in finding out the truth. He should be calling for the truth. Let us put this partisanship aside and look soberly at the very serious allegations that have beset this White House. No man is above the law, and the American people deserve to know the truth.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order with my 5-minute Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PARTIES BECOME LIGHTNING ROD OF PARTISANSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for letting me proceed at this time, because I did want to address what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) was speaking of, because, earlier today, I came down to the House floor and I spoke of the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), and his remarks before GOPAC, and I hope to do it in a way that does not bring any disservice to the House or any personal malice toward anyone.

Look at what is going on here because of comments on both sides. We have all become a lightning rod of partisanship around here. It seems to me, about a week ago, it was the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) who began the personal attacks on the President. While I am a Democrat, a member of

on the minority party, I think every member of this country should be outraged. You have an ongoing investigation. So let us let the investigation proceed.

It seems to me the Speaker some time ago said we should all hold our breath and step backward and let this thing play out. But when we got before a GOPAC dinner, the cash cow of the Republican Party, we just could not seem to leave it go. The claim was that the President is obstructing justice.

We can get up here all night and say all kinds of things about the President and this administration, but let us put forth the evidence; and, by evidence, I mean credible evidence.

By stating or by starting attacks on the President in a partisan manner before a partisan group like GOPAC, I am afraid the Speaker has shown that he cannot lead the House in a fair and impartial review of any inquiry that may take place.

I do not know what the President's guilt or innocence is or whatever it may be in this matter, but what I do know is that, if we stick to the facts and let it properly proceed, and if we rely on, as our constitutional oath requires us to do, credible evidence, credibly submitted to a trier of fact, then maybe we can get to the bottom of this.

Unfortunately, it appears that the Speaker has already reviewed the alleged facts. If he has reviewed the alleged facts, he obviously has made a prejudgment, and he has made himself a judge and jury.

So then I must ask, where is this evidence? Where are these alleged facts? Bring them forth. If he has a report, if the report has been filed with the Speaker's office, bring them forth so all of us in the House have an opportunity to see it. Make it available to at least the Committee on the Judiciary who, by law, has a right to review any inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we would just stick to the facts of the case and not what GOPAC wants to hear but to the facts of the case. But, instead, the Speaker and, as even Roll Call, I mean it is supposed to be a nonpartisan paper, even Roll Call says, "Shame in the Making."

That is exactly what we have when we have investigations and Members coming up here and, if I can use the majority leader's words, put spin on what is going on. Let us not bring shame to the House, but let us have the responsibility to lead and not mislead the House or this country.

The Speaker of the House should be a statesman without prejudging any type of inquiry which may or may not even occur. Instead, I am afraid we have become a lightning rod.

I hate to remind the House, but just over a year ago we had to reprimand the Speaker and fine him approximately \$300,000 for bringing shame and disrespect to this House. Five out of eight ethics charges he was found re-

sponsible for by our own Committee on Ethics. Do we really want to go down this shameful road once again?

I ask that we not bring shame and disrespect to the House by personal attacks. I would hope the Speaker would recuse himself from any participation in any House inquiry.

I have been there. I have done investigation of political people. But you have to do it in an objective manner and not necessarily before the press. You can, and we should, do an investigation, and let the investigation proceed.

But, I mean, even, where have we gone with this whole thing? Even the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight underneath the leadership of the majority party, we have a Privacy Act in this country that the Members of Congress are exempt from. Yet, when given tapes of a personal conversation of a witness who refused to appear, the Privacy Act suddenly did not apply, and the tapes were leaked to the news media, and the personal conversations of this individual were released to the news media.

Is that not abuse of office? Have we not used that office, at least that chairman did, to release tapes of private conversations? Maybe not in violation of the Privacy Act because he was a Member of Congress, but certainly in violation of the spirit and intent of the law. That is what we are doing here with these investigations certainly.

Then when the tapes were given to the oversight committee, they were warned in a letter not to release the tapes. There was sensitive private information. Yet, we still do that, and we hide behind the office of which we hold, a great honor given to us by the American people but, yet, we use it for our benefit.

I would hope that any investigations proceed in a professional manner and stick to the facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SNYDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I came here tonight to speak about what we had accomplished today over in the Cannon Building where we were talking to the American public about how we, the Republican majority, are going to talk about and have a discussion with the American public on drugs. But I am compelled now to change that topic and to speak on the comments that were just made by Members of the Democratic Party.

I want you to know I serve on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and for the last 15 months we have seen a charade that is taking place where Members of the Democratic Party have not only ignored every opportunity to be bipartisan in their attempts to work with us in the majority on dealing with the abuses of the White House in campaign finance, but we have also seen that what they will do is not only not tell the truth but what they will do is to obstruct justice.

□ 1815

Just last week we had a vote whereby we were going to have four people who we were attempting to grant immunity to. These four people are individuals who are involved in the campaign finance scandal of foreign money influence upon the White House.

And what happened is that we very carefully laid out a case by which these four people, they are not high level and they are not involved in a big way, but to where we wanted to talk to these four people and to grant them full immunity from prosecution. We had worked directly with the Department of Justice, and they had indicated that they had no problem with us issuing this immunity.

Yet on a 19-to-nothing vote we were not able to grant these four people immunity because it requires a two-thirds vote of the committee. Not one Democrat wanted to issue immunity because they did not want these four people to tell the truth and to tell their story.

This White House, and I can tell my colleagues that this Democrat Congress and the Members of the Democrat Congress who are Members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight repeatedly have attempted to block every single request that we have made that is reasonable and normal.

And I tell my colleagues that back in 1974, when Richard Nixon was involved

in not only illegalities but constitutional questions, it was the Republican Party that stood up with Senator Howard Baker and asked the tough questions. It was Senator Howard Baker who made sure that not only were the tough questions asked but that he made sure that this President did not escape telling the truth and the whole truth.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will be happy to yield.

(Mr. SUNUNU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SUNUNU. I think it is interesting that the gentleman mentioned the circumstances in 1974, because the previous speaker made the point that somehow the call for the President to be forthcoming, the emphasis that no one is above the law, seemed to be unprecedented. Not only were the speaker's comments fair, I think they stand in stark contrast to the comments of the Speaker of the House in January of 1974, when the Speaker of this body called for the resignation of President Nixon months in advance of any bipartisan investigation.

So at that time there was not only a willingness to move forward without any thought of a bipartisan discussion of the issues but the Speaker of the House was calling for a resignation before that impartial investigation could even move forward.

I would finally like to note that in the gentleman's discussion of the obstruction that the committee has run into, not only were those four immunity requests, that had been approved by the Justice Department, voted down by all 19 Democrat members of the committee, there have been, to date, 92 individuals that have either taken the fifth amendment or fled the country or refused to talk to authorities that have obstructed the progress of the committee's investigation.

And, Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a list of all 92 individuals that have obstructed the investigation in that way.

WITNESSES WHO HAVE FLED OR PLEAD THE 5TH

(Full Committee Hearing—December 9, 1997)

Mr. BURTON. Have you ever experienced so many unavailable witnesses in any matter in which you have prosecuted or on which you have been involved?

FBI Director FREEH. I spent about 16 years doing organized crime cases in New York City, and many people were frequently unavailable.

53 HOUSE & SENATE WITNESSES ASSERTING FIFTH AMENDMENT

John Huang, Gene Lum, Gin F. J. Chen, Mark Middleton, Noland Hill, Jane Huang, Duangnet Kronenberg, Maria L. Hsia, Webster Hubbell, Yogesh Ghandi, Steven Hwang, Gilbert Colon, Irene Wu, Mike Lin, Zie Pan Huang,* Michael Brown, Simon Chen, Kent La, Johnny Chung, David Wang,* Siuw Moi

*Granted Immunity after plead 5th Amendment.

Lian,* Seow Fong Ooi, Bin Yueh Jeng, Hsiu Chu Lin, Jen Chin Hsueh, Chi Rung Wang, Jou Sheng, Judy Hsu, Jane Dewi Tahir, Maria Mapili, Jie Su Hsiao, Hsiu Luan Tseng, Mark Jimenez, Woody Hwang, Sioeng Fei Man, Terri Bradley, Man Ya Shih,* Keshi Zhan,* Yi Chu,* Joseph Landon,* Nora Lum, Larry Wong, Na-chi "Nancy" Lee, Hueutsan Huang,* Yue Chu,* Man Ho,* Manlin Fong,* Yumei Yang, Arapaho/Cheyenne Indians, Hsin Chen Shih, Shu Jen Wu,* Charles Intrigo, and Jessica Elinitarta.

21 WITNESSES HAVE LEFT THE COUNTRY

Charlie Trie (has returned to United States), Antonio Pan, Arief Wirindinata, Subandi Tanuwidjaja, Susanto Tanuwidjaja, Yanti Ardi, Laureen Elnitiarta, Pauline Kanchanarak, John H.K. Lee, Ted Sioeng, Soraya Wiradinata, Suryanti Tanuwidjaja, Nanny Nitiarta, Sandra Elnitiarta, Ming Chen, Agus Setiawan, Dewi Tirta, Felix Ma, Subandi Tanuwidjaja, Yopie Elnitiarta, and Sundari Elnitiarta.

18 FOREIGN WITNESSES HAVE REFUSED TO BE INTERVIEWED BY INVESTIGATIVE BODIES

Ng Lap Seng, Ken Hsui, Eugene Wu, Suma Ching Hai, Ambrose Hsuing, Bruce Cheung, Stephen Riady, John Muncy, Mochtar Riady, James Riady, Lay Kweek Wie, Wang Jun, Roy Tirtadji, James Lin, Stanley Ho, Daniel Wu, Li Kwai Fai, and Hogen Fukunaga.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. We are attempting to run a fair and open bipartisan investigation of the wrongdoings of the Clinton White House. It will require a minimum of one Democrat asking to seek to have the truth.

The bottom line is, in 1974, Senator Howard Baker stepped forth and insisted. We ask for that same resolve today.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ISRAEL ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some contentious discussion of our partisan divisions. I rise for a task that I think is far more joyful and one as to which this entire body is united, and that is I rise to congratulate the people of Israel on the 50th anniversary of their rebirth and independence.

Today represents the 50th anniversary of Israel, as determined by the Jewish lunar calendar. And it is with great joy that I point out that House Joint Resolution 102 was adopted by this House 2 days ago by a vote of 402 to nothing, demonstrating the united and bipartisan support that the State of Israel and the close U.S.-Israel relationship enjoyed in this House.

We should reflect that in August of 1897, a century ago, the first Zionist Congress affirmed its aspiration to form a Jewish homeland in the historic State of Israel. After the horrors of the Holocaust, in which one-third of the Jewish population of the world lost their lives, the Jewish people returned to their ancient homeland and established the State of Israel.